

New Hampshire Special Education Program Approval Report

SAU 6

**Robert Patterson, Superintendent
Terri Senio, Special Ed. Director**

Final Report May 8, 2000

**Visit Conducted on:
January 19-20, 2000**

Team Members:

Nancy Brogden, Chairperson	
Robert Wells, State Consultant	
John Berge	Joan Binder
Kelly Carter	Meg Daisy
Jeffrey Goddard	Harvey Harkness
Joy Hutchins	Rick Matte
Maureen Moore	Gina Moylan
Peter Nagle	Barbara Potvin
Tim Quinney	

New Hampshire Special Education Program Approval Report

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction**

- II. Status of Corrective Actions from Previous On-Site**

- III. Issues of Significance**

- IV. Citations to the New Hampshire Standards for the Education of Students with Disabilities. (Commendations, Citations and Suggestions for each school)**

Note: It should be noted that suggestions are not considered corrective actions and therefore are given as technical assistance. The district is not mandated to implement them.

New Hampshire Special Education Program Approval Report

SAU 6

I. INTRODUCTION:

A New Hampshire Department of Education Special Education Program Approval visit was conducted in SAU 6 comprised of the following schools: Maple Avenue School, Disnard Elementary School, Bluff Elementary School, Claremont Middle School, Unity Elementary School, Cornish Elementary School, Sugar River Technical Center, Stevens High School and the VASE Collaborative Classroom. The visiting team met on January 19 and 20, 2000 in order to review the status of special education services being provided to eligible students.

Activities related to this evaluation included the close review of all the teaching certifications of special education staff, analysis of SPEDIS data and random inspection of student records. Interviews were held with the Superintendent, the Special Education Director, building principals, regular and special education teachers, related service personnel and administrators, as time and availability permitted. In addition, the team conducted parent interviews via telephone. Throughout the visit, the team had full cooperation from school personnel and this helpfulness was greatly appreciated.

The report that you are about to read represents the consensus of all the members of the visiting team. Please keep in mind that this is a "report for exception", meaning that only exceptions to the NH State Standards have been addressed. If a component is not mentioned, that does not mean that the team did not review it; it just means that there were no citations of noncompliance to the Standards found in that particular area.

II. STATUS OF PREVIOUS ON-SITE: *Conducted on April 4 and 5, 1994*

SAU 6 has made many program improvements since the last program approval evaluation conducted in April of 1994. It was evident to the visiting team that a genuine attempt to rectify citations has been made by staff and administration throughout the SAU. Based on review of the 2000 application materials, interviews with staff, parents and visits to each school, it was the consensus of the team that several of the previous citations noted in 1994 have been resolved, while others are still in the process of being addressed.

Specifically, the issue of facilities has been addressed. Through a major building plan and reorganization of elementary and middle schools, SAU 6 has made the learning space for children more appropriate. However, both the Unity and the Maple Avenue School teams mentioned facilities as an issue stating that more space is needed for both regular and special education students. A temporary situation at Stevens High School exists because of a faulty roof, but repairs will be completed soon. Overall, SAU 6 should be commended for its efforts to improve facilities since the last compliance review.

II. STATUS OF PREVIOUS ON-SITE: (Continued)

Staffing was cited as an issue in the 1994 review. It was gratifying to see that staff has been increased in all buildings and while there is still some evidence of high caseloads for special educators, tremendous gain has been made in this area.

Written Prior Notice appears to be present in most files. However, the use of the written prior notice form as a replacement for meeting summaries and minutes is of concern.

Consistent monitoring of the special education process continues to be an issue, especially for out-of-district students and for those students in transition from one program to another.

Curriculum seems to be in place for the separate programs within the SAU. Emphasis continues to be on access to the regular curriculum for special needs students.

It is obvious that staff training has improved greatly over the last five years. Still, mention was made by several staff members that they see a need for continuing professional development.

In summary, SAU has made significant gains over the last five years to improve facilities, staffing, programming, curriculum and monitoring of and for special education students.

III. ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Within each of the schools in SAU 6, there is a supportive, enthusiastic atmosphere for the provision of services for all students in the least restrictive environment. This enthusiasm and support is fostered throughout SAU 6 by faculty, administration, support personnel, secretarial staff and parents. In many ways it is clear that the Claremont, Unity and Cornish schools are working hard to offer a wide continuum of services and programs to all children, including access to the general curriculum. This is evidenced by programs such as the preschool program, the VASE collaborative program and the STEP program. The new District Evaluation team is commendable and will greatly increase a smooth evaluation process, the inclusion of parents and communication among team members.

All of the staff within SAU 6 appear to be committed to providing quality services to all students and teachers were consistently described as dedicated, supportive and committed to positive learning experiences for all children.

Although there are many commendable things happening in SAU 6, there were areas of concern raised by the visiting team. The main concern that surfaced was the lack of a systematized method of record keeping. While some of the state model forms are being used, it was difficult to find information in files to indicate that compliance with state and federal regulations is being met. Meeting minutes were not present in many files. Case managers are using the written prior notice to indicate decisions. However, this form does not indicate who participated in the meeting, whether and what input parents had, and whether rights and documents had been given to parents. There was no evidence, in many cases, that parents had given permission for testing. Written evaluations and evaluation summaries were missing in many files. While there is evidence to show that efforts are made to include parents, files show that they do not attend and may not be fully informed of decisions made. A systematic

III. ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE: (Continued)

method of filing and rosters would also help case managers keep students in compliance. SAU 6 has a high rate (over 14%) of students who are out of compliance, which is an issue that warrants immediate attention.

Another concern is in the area of transition. Several team members indicated that there does not appear to be appropriate transition planning for students moving from one program to another or from school to school. This was mentioned from team members who visited Unity Elementary School, the STEP program, middle to high school, the preschool program (transitioning from other agencies) and the VASE program.

Out-of-district files are missing many components and the lack of organization within student records makes it difficult to confirm compliance. Of the seven files reviewed, while all had current IEPs, most were missing meeting notices, evaluation permissions, evidence of multidisciplinary team, and evidence that outside agencies (for 402 students) and parents were involved. With so many out of district placements and court involved students in SAU 6, it would seem impossible for the Director of Special Education to case manage all of these students and to keep them all in compliance.

Overall, SAU 6 has made significant growth in program and facilities improvements since the 1994 compliance visit. The attitude of staff is enthusiastic and the collaboration of all parties is strong. Each building conveys a warm and caring attitude for all children to learn, and strong programming. Inclusionary practices are evident in each building. The team would like to recognize and reinforce the philosophy, vision and goals that each school is working toward and commend them for their support of quality services to all children.

IV. COMMENDATIONS, CITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS: SAU-WIDE:

Name of Program(s) Visited: All

COMMENDATIONS:

- SAU 6 staff are dedicated with a strong and positive commitment to children throughout the district.
- All staff are to be commended for their use of inclusionary practices in the least restrictive model and for the wide continuum of services provided.
- There has been a genuine attempt in SAU 6 to resolve issues of noncompliance noted during the previous program approval visit.
- The SAU must be commended for its supportive leadership, especially from the current Director of Special Education.
- SAU 6 is commended for instituting the District Evaluation Team to insure that referrals and evaluations are timely and within guidelines.
- The establishment of new programs in the last few years, such as the preschool program, STEP and VASE collaborative programs seems to be quite effective.
- SAU 6 should be commended for increasing staff to a level that is more appropriate.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

SAU 6 has an unusually large number of students out of compliance (over 14%). An analysis of these records shows the following reasons for the non-compliance:

Ed. 1107.01(c) Assessments: Out of 57 students, 20 were out of compliance because of assessments that were not done within the required timeframe.

Ed. 1107.06 Evaluations: 17 students had evaluations that were more than three years old.

Ed. 1115.03 Placement: 26 Students did not have placements (IEPs) on the compliance date.

300.346 IEP development considerations: Of 37 files reviewed, 16 files either had no clear evidence that parental input and concerns were considered.

Ed. 1107.03 Multidisciplinary Team: There was no evidence in 9 of 37 files that the evaluation team met the criteria for this standard.

Ed. 1107.06 Evaluation Summary: In 11 of 37 files, no current written evaluation summary was present.

Ed. 1109.05 Notice of IEP meeting: In 11 of 37 files, there was no evidence that parents were given a 10-day notice.

Ed. 1109.11 IEP progress: 12 of 37 files did not show evidence of regular and systematic monitoring of the IEP.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order), Continued

Ed. 1125.03 Written Prior Notice: 22 of 37 files did not contain all the content of the required written prior notice.

Ed. 1125.04 Evaluations: 12 of 37 files did not contain written consent to evaluate.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Systematize special education forms throughout the district.
- Reinstate meeting minutes. Some training with staff on how to write brief but concise meeting minutes might be helpful.
- The SAU may want to consider the establishment of building level special education coordinators to oversee compliance and monitoring in each building. At the very least, print out SPEDIS reports by building on a regular basis, so case managers can be aware of compliance issues for their students.
- The SAU may want to consider having a separate case manager for all out of district students.

Bluff Elementary School

PROGRAM(S) VISITED: 1) Resource Room 2) Pre-school

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 3 Files

COMMENDATIONS:

- The school staff is dedicated, caring and have a positive attitude.
- The special education staff provide strong support to the regular education staff.
- The preschool is an exemplary model of inclusion and community involvement.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

<u>Ed. 1107.06</u>	3 year dates are exceeded due to using the written evaluation summary date instead of the earliest evaluation.
<u>Ed. 1109.01</u>	2 files: lacked annual measurable goals with short-term objectives.
<u>Ed. 1109.11</u>	1 file: Quarterly reviews occurred, but were not stated in IEP.
<u>Ed. 1109.04</u>	1 file: lacked evidence of 10-day notice to parents.
<u>Ed. 1115.06</u>	1 file: lacked evidence that LRE is determined annually.
<u>Ed. 1125.04</u>	1 file: lacked evidence of written consent for placement.
<u>Ed. 1109.03(1)</u>	Parent not involved in evaluation plan or determination of disability.
<u>Ed. 1109.11</u>	3 files: lacked evidence of how parents are informed of IEP progress, i.e. frequency and method.
<u>Ed. 1123.05</u>	3 files: lacked evidence that procedural safeguards were included with IEP notification.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Systemize IEP and related forms with integration of new IDEA regulations and provide technical assistance and training to special education staff.
- Provide occupational therapy staff with additional space for provision of services.
- Ensure that all documents requiring signatures include the person's name and title.

Cornish Elementary School

PROGRAM(S) VISITED: 1) Learning Center 2) Inclusion

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 3 Files

COMMENDATIONS:

- The staff's obvious dedication to the students and school is commended.
- Inservice training is provided on a regular basis.
- The increase in special education staff has had a positive impact for all regular and special education staff.
- There are certified staff in the areas of LD, EH and general special education.
- The principal is very knowledgeable and involved with the special education programming.
- The "summary of evaluations" is a valuable tool and provides solid information regarding assessments.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

Ed. 1107.07(c) 2 files: evaluation meetings did not include parents due to difficulties with itinerant providers.

Ed. 1109.01(l) 3 files: no documentation of transition plans found.

Ed. 1115.06 3 files: least restrictive environment noted by yes or no check and did not include a descriptive statement.

Ed. 1125.03 WPN documentation did not meet requirements as outlined in the Standards.

Ed. 1125.04(a) 2 files had permission to test but no evidence that tests had been completed.

Ed. 1109.11 2 files: lacked documentation as to when progress reports are done, although staff indicate they are done on the same basis as report cards.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Expand present level of performance to include more information on student needs and how these needs affect their ability to participate in regular curricula.

Disnard Elementary School

PROGRAM(S) VISITED: 1) Modified Regular 2) Resource Room 3) Self-contained classroom

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 3 Files

COMMENDATIONS:

- The staff at the school are dedicated to all students, are experienced and work well together.
- The strong commitment to collaboration is exemplified by the weekly team meetings.
- All appropriate staff have copies of IEPs and teachers initial to show modifications have been implemented.
- There is a commitment by all staff to inclusion and regular education teachers feel equally responsible for the success of special education students.
- The district is beginning to address paraprofessional training needs.
- The school principal is supportive and actively involved in the special education process.
- The "new" case management system is going well.
- The pre-referral process is very well established and is used by regular education staff.
- Use of the district-wide evaluation committee is commended.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

<u>Ed. 1107.03(a)</u>	1 file: unable to determine the roles/positions of team members.
<u>Ed. 1107.07(c)</u>	3 files: no evidence that evaluation report and determination of eligibility was given to parents.
<u>Ed. 1109.01(c)&(d)</u>	2 files: IEP states student is in modified regular 3 rd grade classroom; the student spends no time with non-disabled peers. Student is in self-contained class.
<u>Ed. 1109.03</u>	1 file: lacked evidence of regular education teacher on the evaluation team.
<u>Ed. 1109.04</u>	2 files: contained evidence that procedural safeguards were given at the IEP meeting instead of with the notice of meeting.
<u>Ed. 1109.04(a)</u>	1 file: unable to determine if parents were given 10-day notice of IEP meeting as meeting notice did not indicate purpose of meeting. 3 files: no evidence that procedural safeguards are given with each notice of IEP meeting.
<u>Ed. 1109.11</u>	3 files: no evidence that parents are informed of progress as often as are parents of non-disabled peers.
<u>Ed. 1123.05</u>	1 file: contained an evaluation with no permission to test or notice of rights. 3 files: could not determine if parents received notification of rights.

Disnard Elementary School, Continued

- 300.347(a)(4) 1 file: no explanation of extent to which child will not participate with non-disabled peers in regular class.
- 300.347(a)(5)(ii)(A) 1 file: no evidence as to why NHEIAP is not appropriate.
- 300.347(a)(5)(ii)(B) 2 files: no evidence as to how student will be assessed.
- 300.347(a)(7)(ii) 3 files: no evidence as to how parents are informed of progress made toward meeting IEP goals.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Show greater evidence of the link between evaluation results and IEP objectives.
- Develop a clearer plan for consideration of extended school year programming. Ensure that decisions are based upon regulatory guidelines versus parent interest.
- Include official meeting notes in files to document considerations and reasons for decisions.
- Examine how the needs of all learners are being accommodated. Ex.: what are teaching strategies and methodologies for developing specified skills?
- Technological resources should be increased. In one case, a computer need specified in an IEP was not fulfilled. This particular computer purchase probably would be Medicaid reimbursed.
- One teacher expressed concern about next year's supplies budget. Will funds be available for purchase of needed textbooks/materials? Several teachers referred to the need to purchase materials with their own money.
- Develop a clearer plan for behavioral support when the principal is out of the building.
- If not in meeting minutes, develop a method of documenting parents received copies of reports and procedural safeguards. Discussions of ESY, IEP development considerations and LRE options also need to be documented.
- When services are received in the resource room (pullout), they should be documented as such on the IEP, placement and/or SPEDIS forms.
- The use of testing accommodations/modifications needs to be explored with NHEIAP or other district-wide tests versus exempting all special education students.

Maple Avenue School

PROGRAM(S) VISITED: 1) Resource Room 2) Modified Regular Classroom

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 2 Files

COMMENDATIONS:

- The special education and regular education staff work extremely well together and provide a wonderful atmosphere of collaboration.
- The staff are very knowledgeable and are dedicated and committed to their students and community.
- Paraprofessionals are very dedicated and have good teaching skills.
- The staff work hard including special education students in regular education and in the pre-referral process.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

Ed. 1107.02 2 files: lacked evidence of partial notification of referral.

Ed. 1107.03 1 file: lacked evidence of appropriate evaluation team membership.

Ed. 1107.05 2 files: evaluation was not conducted within 45 days and there was no evidence of signed parental extension.

Ed. 1107.07 2 files: team determining eligibility lacked appropriate team composition.

Ed. 1109.01(j) 1 file: did not indicate service providers on IEP.

Ed. 1109.01(k) 2 files: IEPs lacked indication of statement of party assuming financial responsibility.

SUGGESTIONS:

- The SAU needs to address the crowded conditions at Maple Avenue School.
- Although paraprofessionals were noted to be exceptional, they would benefit from additional support and training.

Unity Elementary School

PROGRAM(S) VISITED: 1) Resource Room 2) Modified Regular Classroom

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 3 Files

COMMENDATIONS:

- Student records were well organized.
- The resource room model appears to be working well and meeting student needs.
- The collaboration between special education and regular education staff is evident.
- Staff are committed to the inclusion model.
- Using meeting times with aides as an opportunity to provide training is extremely beneficial in helping support staff implement modifications.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

Ed. 1107.07 3 files: parent is not listed as a team member in determining eligibility for services.

Ed. 1109.04 3 files: transition plan not found in IEP for students' age 14 and over.

Ed. 1109.03 3 files: parents are not listed as IEP team members.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Transition plans should be developed for students as part of the IEP for any student 14 or older.
- Consider the addition of another case manager. The current caseload does not allow time for the casemanager to work with preschool and high school students.
- More space is needed at the elementary school for both regular and special education students.
- Modify existing forms to ensure documentation of parents as part of the IEP team.
- Vocational options should be available for students in the 7th and 8th grades.
- An addition to the guidance department should be considered to help implement social skills program.
- Consider a teaming model for grades 7 & 8 to help students with the transition to high school.

Claremont Middle School

PROGRAM(S) VISITED: 1) Learning Center 2) Self-Contained Classroom
3) Modified Regular Classroom

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 4 Files

COMMENDATIONS:

- Communication between regular and special education staff is outstanding. The daily contact and team meetings provide for a positive school climate.
- Staff use existing resources to provide services to student for the maximum benefit of the children.
- Dedication and personal commitment of the special education staff, including paraprofessionals, is highly commendable.
- Administration is to be commended for fostering a school-wide atmosphere of cooperation and community.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

<u>Ed 1107.02(d)</u>	2 files: lacked evidence of parents receiving procedural safeguards.
<u>Ed. 1107.07(c)</u>	2 files: lacked documentation that parents were provided with copies of evaluation report and/or determination of eligibility.
<u>Ed. 1109.04</u>	3 files: lacked evidence that procedural safeguards were given with each notice of IEP meeting.
<u>Ed. 1109.01(b)</u>	4 files: IEP lacked measurable annual goals.
<u>Ed. 1109.03</u>	4 files IEP lacked verifiable signatures.
<u>Ed. 1123.05</u>	2 files: lacked sufficient evidence of distribution of procedural safeguards.
<u>Ed. 1125.03</u>	4 files: questionable use of WPN as meeting minutes.
<u>Ed. 1119.04</u>	4 files: evidenced a severe lack of access to adequate technology for implementation of IEPs.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Use separate notes with all parties signing in for all formal meetings.
- Obtain more computers school wide.

Stevens High School

PROGRAM(S) VISITED: 1) Special Education Programs

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 6 Files

COMMENDATIONS:

- All staff are professional, supportive and cooperative, and are open to sharing views and opinions.
- The faculty/staff are commended for their flexibility during periods of crisis.
- The staff are working hard to organize student records and bring them into compliance. During the review, the files were readily available and in order.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

Ed. 1107.02(b)(d) 3 files: lacked evidence of written notice to parents.

Ed. 1107.03(a) 1 file: lacked evidence that LEA representative and parents on team.
1 file: SLP listed as contributor, but signature not included on document.

Ed. 1107.05 1 file: no date on evaluation; notation made to "see attached", no item attached.
1 file: additional testing conducted within 45 days, however no evidence that the team reviewed the original evaluation data within 45 days.

Ed. 1107.07 6 files: lacked evidence parents given copy of evaluation report and determination.

Ed. 1109.01 6 files: technically in compliance, however goals are very general.

Ed. 1109.03 6 files: lacked evidence that student's interest were taken into account.

Ed. 1109.03 2 files: lacked evidence that parent and regular education teacher were included on evaluation team.

Ed. 1109.04 3 files: lacked evidence parents given 10-day notice of IEP meeting.
6 files: lacked evidence parents given procedural safeguards with notice of IEP meeting.
3 files: lacked evidence that student was invited to meeting.
4 files: IEP did not contain transition statement.

Ed. 1109.11 6 files: IEP lacked documentation of regular and systematic monitoring.

Ed. 1123.05 6 files: lacked evidence of parental rights given with notification of meetings.

Ed. 1125.04(a) 1 file: lacked evidence of permission to conduct re-evaluation.

300.346 6 files: lacked documentation of parental input and concerns.

Stevens High School, Continued

SUGGESTIONS:

- The SAU may want to modify the team meeting/minutes form to provide more detail that would better document parental involvement, consideration of test data, notification of rights, etc.
- Consider providing in-service training to review the differences among student goals, student objectives, teacher accommodations and instructional modifications.
- Review the IEP format to clarify where the accommodations are. Current format appears to treat accommodations as thought.
- Review the IEP format to clarify what services are to be given/placement. This is present, but somewhat muddled. Perhaps a specific section for program and related services would help.
- Watch for consistency when transferring data - one file contained documentation indicating the student was coded with a "speech/language" disability, however IEP listed coding as "LD".
- Ensure that all documents contain full date, including month, day and year.
- The transition process between grades 8 and 9 could be reviewed to eliminate some issues concerning class placement.
- Examine guidelines for meetings to see if some compromise can be made to allow regular education teachers, as well as parents, to attend meetings. It appears that parents' definition of mutually agreeable date/time is often made at the exclusion of teacher attendance.
- Explore the possibility of having a parallel to the CAP program for students under age 17.
- Have contact logs as part of student file.
- Teachers indicate that their working files contain progress grades. Somehow, these should be transferred to the "official" IEP on a regular basis.
- Modify the IEP to include a transition plan component as part of the process.

Sugar River Technical Center

PROGRAM(S) VISITED: 1) Special Education Programs

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 3 Files

COMMENDATIONS:

- Staff possess a positive attitude, work very well as a team and are committed to all students.
- The facility provides a wonderful learning environment with adequate instructional materials.
- The early education program is outstanding and accredited by the state.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

Ed. 1107.02(d) 3 files: lacked evidence that parents are issued rights.

Ed. 1107.05(a) 1 file: lacked current evaluation information.

Ed. 1107.05(k) 1 file: evaluation was not conducted within 45 days; no evidence of signed parental extension.

Ed. 1109.03(d) 3 files: lacked evidence that student interests were considered in transition planning.

Ed. 1109.04 2 files: lacked evidence that parental rights were issued.

Ed. 1109.04(d) 3 files: lacked evidence that meeting notice indicated purpose was to discuss transition.

Ed. 1125.03 2 files: written prior notice did not contain all components.

SUGGESTIONS:

- There is a need for staff training related to understanding the nature of disabilities and accommodations necessary in the classroom.

VASE

PROGRAM(S) VISITED: VASE

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 3 Files

COMMENDATIONS:

- Teachers are very knowledgeable and supportive special education.
- There is good daily communication between the school staff and home.
- The school psychologist and teacher work well together for the benefit of all students.

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

Ed. 1125.04 1 file: lacked all evaluation documentation.
2 files: lacked evidence of parental written permission to test.

Ed. 1107.02(b,d) 2 files: lacked all referral information.

Ed. 1107.03 1 file: lacked all evaluation team membership documentation.

Ed. 1107.05 1 file: lacked all evaluation documentation.

Ed. 1107.06 1 file: lacked all evaluation documentation, including examiners, permission to test and summary reports.

Ed. 1109.04 3 files: lacked evidence of written notice to parents of meetings.

Ed. 1109.01(l) 3 files: lacked statement of transition services for 14-15 year old students.
1 file: IEP lacked signature of parent and LEA representative.

Ed. 1125.03 1 file: lacked evidence of written prior notice.

Ed. 1125.04 1 file: lacked evidence of written consent for placement.

Ed. 1109.03 1 file: lacked evidence that evaluation team was appropriate.
1 file: documentation regarding placement not in file.

Ed. 1123.04(a)(7) No public listing of the names and positions of those who have access to personally identifiable information.

Ed. 1123.14 1 file: did not contain record of disclosure

SUGGESTIONS:

- To assist in addressing the issue of missing paperwork, assign a case manager that is responsible for all meetings, files, etc. for the VASE program students.

Out-Of-District Files

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 4 Files

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

Ed. 1125.04 4 filed: lacked evidence of written consent to evaluate.

Ed. 1109.04 4 files: did not indicate who was invited to IEP meeting.

Ed. 1123.03 4 files: lacked evidence of all components required for written prior notice.

Ed. 1109.01 3 files: lacked parental signatures on IEP.

Ed. 1109.03 4 files: lacked documentation that parents were involved in evaluation or determination meeting.

SUGGESTIONS:

- The SAU needs to ensure that out-of-district files are comprehensive and up to date.

ADDENDUM

JAMES O. MONITORING PROGRAM

SAU 6

Student File Review

Case Study Document

Reimbursement Claim Form

Case Study Addendum Form

<p style="text-align: center;">ADDENDUM JAMES O. MONITORING PROGRAM</p>

SAU 6

NUMBER OF FILES REVIEWED: 3 FILES

CITATIONS: (in numerical order)

<u>Ed. 1107.03(a)</u>	2 files: not able to determine appropriate team composition
<u>Ed. 1107.03(j)</u>	1 file: lacked current evaluation information.
<u>Ed. 1107.06(a)</u>	3 files: not able to determine if evaluation was conducted within 45 days.
<u>Ed. 1107.07(c)</u>	3 files: not able to determine evaluation team membership.
<u>Ed. 1107.08(a)</u>	1 file: LD teacher was not included on LD evaluation team.
<u>Ed. 1123.04</u>	2 files: lacked evidence of notification of parental rights.
<u>Ed. 1109.01(g)</u>	1 file: lacked projected dates and duration of IEP.
<u>Ed. 1109.01(n)</u>	1 file: lacked appropriate signatures.
<u>Ed. 1109.03</u>	1 file: lacked evidence of IEP team composition.
<u>Ed. 1109.04</u>	1 file: IEP lacked evidence of parental participation.

SUGGESTIONS:

None